LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

A BITTER WINTER

R. Page Arnot

★

THE McQUILKIN INTERVIEW

'Wreckers' and the BBC

★

NORMAN ATKINSON, M.P. on VIETNAM

★

POVERTY '68

Margaret Morris

★

Quaestor on the NEW NAZIS' WAR PROGRAMME

★

Käthe Kollwitz; Theatre Censorship; Tony Selby

JANUARY 1968

2s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. 50 No. 1 JANUARY . 1968

CONTENTS

Page

Notes of the Month: A Bitter Winter. *In the Soup—Who or What is Responsible?—A False Policy—Ally or Satellite?—Deaf Ears in Downing Street—The Vietnam Massacres—The Greater Danger—A Character from Pickwick Papers—Only One Paper Supports Strikers—Democracy in Danger—Caesarism—Fight for Democracy at Home and Abroad* .. **R. Page Arnot** 1

Forty Years Ago. 14

The McQuilkin Interview. BBC talks to a so-called 'wrecker'. .. 15

1968—Will it bring Peace in Vietnam? Anti-war movement grows in U.S. .. .. .. **Norman Atkinson, M.P.** 18

New Year Greetings. 23

The Arts Today. Lithographs by **Käthe Kollwitz;** A Declaration of Intent, **Tony Selby;** A Happy New Year and a Resolution, **Editor, The Arts Today;** Censorship, **Stephen Sedley.** .. 24

The War Programme of German Imperialism. Threat to peace by the new Nazis .. .. **Quaestor** 32

Poverty '68. The grim reality behind the façade of 'affluence'. **Margaret Morris** 35

Engels and Pike on the Industrial Revolution. Article on working conditions in Britain in first half of 19th century, translated by D. N. Pritt .. .. **Jurgen Kuczynski** 38

Publications received. 41

Book Reviews. 'Introduction to Neo-Colonialism', Jack Woddis: *R.P.D.;* 'The Life of Eleanor Marx', Chushichi Tsuzuki: *Allen Hutt;* 'The Reds and the Blacks', William Attwood: *Joan Bellamy;* 'The Wobblies', Patrick Renshaw: *Charles Ashleigh* .. 42

League Table of Strikes. 47

Revaluation. .. .. **Helen Falber** 48

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

A BITTER WINTER

December 10, 1967

Here we are in the opening days of the opening month of the year 1968 of the Christian Era: and soon to be on the threshold of the year 1388 in the Muslim Era. In either case (or in any other of the older conventional ways to reckon the lapse of terrestrial time), it is a convenient moment to sum up the recent past, make a trial balance and survey the twelve months ahead. So far it has been a bitter winter. The accumulation of frustrations has made everyone in Britain ill-at-ease, angry, perplexed about the future. Class antagonisms within Britain are visibly sharpening as seen not only in the series of strikes but also in the extension of the strikes to the salaried strata, with teachers refusing to supervise meals, bank clerks turning up on strike-picket duty, the 48-hour strike of BOAC pilots on December 10 and 11, and similar action contemplated by the pilots of British European Airways. All the 'top brass' of British industry as well as of the services are bound to be concerned when they see more and more employees realising common interests and taking to trade union action. They may seek to console themselves with their knowledge that the Tory Party and Labour Party Right-wing leaders are preparing for 'reform' of trade union law and for means to cripple trade union action. But their apprehension that everything is moving towards a serious clash is not stilled. So much is obvious: but first of all let us see where we are in January 1968.

In the Soup

Here we are—in the soup again! Is there any other big capitalist country in the same slough of despond? If there were, it would hardly be any consolation. But the fact is that not only are the dozen socialist countries going ahead at great pace but nearly all the bigger capitalist countries have a better record than Britain. Here we are with unemployment again, at a higher figure than last winter and with a further rise ahead. Here we are again, no longer with wage freeze (a freeze can become a thaw) but with an unthawable iron clamp of wage restraint which is to be distinguished from wage freeze by the fact that the trade unions through their elected TUC General Council have been invited themselves to put the gyves upon their own wrists.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meantime the sanctions and the penalties already laid down in the Prices and Incomes Act of Summer 1966 are now likely to be reinforced. Here we are with prices of imports up: and a vicious curb applied at the same time to keep wages down. Here is the threat to one particular industry after another: the nationalised coal mining industry is to be run down nearly to extinction for the benefit of the oil trusts and their tycoons that suck gas up out of the depths of the North Sea and lay their grasp upon the riches of Britain on the continental shelf. Agriculture, through the acceptance by Labour Ministers (with the exception of Douglas Jay) of the Tory policy of joining the Customs Union behind protectionist tariffs that is called 'the Common Market', of six powers, six only, while Europe as a whole is kept outside, is in a sad quandary. Agriculture suffers not only the worst ever epidemic of Foot and Mouth Disease but for years beforehand the insidious erosion of its human personnel. The manpower that can cope with our only indigenous fuel is being sapped away. So too with the skilled farmworker. So too with the skilled body of railwaymen: and all through submission to the great oil trusts that 'dieselised' the railways instead of the promised electrification. Here we are again with rising food prices, rising rents, steeper taxes, lower real wages, lower benefits in general, a worsening of the recently revealed statistics of poverty with one in seven of the population below the acknowledged level of subsistence. An accumulation in almost every sphere of evil for the majority and higher profits and golden handshakes and colossal salaries for the tiny minority. And all for what? What have we gained? What have we to look forward to after all the happenings and all the measures? Nothing at all. Only a repetition of old ministerial prophecies and promises of 'pie in the sky'. But the sky is further off now than when we were younger, when Harold Wilson's promises raised such high hopes.

High hope—that was

With what high hopes, some forty months ago, the people of Britain and in particular the workers in factory and mine, in ship and dock, looked forward to the coming of a fourth Labour Government. The first Labour Government in 1924 had gone down with ignominy after nine months. The second Labour Government ended with the 'deflation, devaluation and damnation' crisis in 1931, after 25 months. The third Labour Government with its overwhelming majority in summer 1945 came to an end six years later in face of a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

financial crisis, having first (in 1949) devalued the £ sterling down to 2.86 and then cast an extra arms burden of £1,600,000,000 on the British people. Thrice thereafter, in the General Elections of 1951, 1955 and 1959 the Tories were given a majority. Only as the reality of Tory rule sank in and only as the disappointment and wounded feelings caused by the previous three Labour Governments had begun to be forgotten, did the workers turn again towards Labour. Then, in 1964 it appeared that the hopes were at last to be realised. Here was a brand new leader of the party—Harold Wilson, born in West Riding in the heavy woollen district. The enraptured members of the Labour Party Conference could then declaim Shakespeare's lines:

Now is the winter of our discontent
Made glorious summer by this son of York

What high hopes these were! This fourth Labour Government would rescue the country from the Tories. In speech after speech, effectively and carefully read from the rostrum, Harold Wilson drew a picture of a British future where science, technology and welfare would predominate and make Great Britain once more really great. Difficult times were ahead. But, like Alpine peaks, with good guides they could be scaled and overcome. Such were the sanguine expectations of many a Labour Party member and many a trade union leader. These expectations were doomed to be unfulfilled.

Who or What is Responsible?

Pictures of the future become promises. Political promises arouse expectancy and hopes: but 'hope deferred maketh the heart sick'. Not only so, but it obliges the promise-makers to explain what has gone wrong and why things have not turned out according to plan. Consequently any amount of explanations have been forthcoming from ministers, from the first snags encountered in winter 1964-65, from George Brown's *Declaration of Intent* up to his prodigious *Plan for Britain* and then up to the first collapse of July 20, 1966, when the Prime Minister announced the clamp down on movement of wages—that Prices and Incomes policy which brought immediate unemployment and took only sixteen months to end in devaluation of the pound sterling. The explanations, always lucid and often plausible, were readily forthcoming on each occasion. Circumstances, the television audiences were told, had compelled the shattering of hopes —but only temporarily. Fell circumstance was at fault: and also a series of attendant demons including foreign bankers ('the gnomes of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Zurich'); General Charles de Gaulle; 'wreckers' in engineering and shipbuilding (the shop stewards); the official national strike of seamen in 1966 (with a very sinister .01 per cent of Communists behind the scenes—as revealed by the secret service); the 'ungrateful' mine-workers (as per George Brown) and the intractable railwaymen; the unofficial strikes everywhere they occurred; and, of course, the recalcitrant dockers of London and Liverpool. But never was any suggestion made that policy which has ended in set-backs and disaster might itself be at fault, might itself be a wrong policy, a policy false to the hopes of the British people, a policy false to socialism.

A False Policy

Yet it has been mistaken policy that has led to disaster, more precisely mistaken policy overseas, foreign policy and arms policy. The symptoms that revealed this sickness of the pound sterling (itself symptomatic of a deeper malady in the body politic) are familiar enough. They have been recounted over and over again by journalists, skilled as jugglers with all the jargon of the crisis. 'The country is spending more than it earns with a resultant imbalance of payments, leading in the end to devaluation.' Thereafter follows the usual string of measures to earn more abroad and spend less at home. Yet it is not home expenditure but swollen expenditure overseas that is the root of the trouble. Overseas military expenditure together with a reckless profusion of capitalist investment abroad (now totalling nearly ten thousand million pounds) is responsible. Overseas expenditure of this order is the cancer that has to be cut out.

A Tory Foreign Policy

These expenditures are linked with a financial and foreign policy of what was once freely termed British Imperialism but is now draped in the sheep's clothing of Commonwealth. But is it a new Foreign Policy which the Labour Government has conducted? No! It is a Tory Foreign Policy. It is the policy pursued for thirteen years by the Tories. It was actually launched by Churchill in March 1946 in his speech at Fulton, Missouri, based on the great lie, the 'danger' from the Soviet Union, adopted by Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin and finally proclaimed in an envenomed form by the President of the United States as the Truman Doctrine on March 12, 1947. It was at the beginning of this century that the founders of the Labour Party and their scribes used to refer contemptuously to the old trade union leaders in Parliament (the miners' leaders and others) who

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accepted the Liberal Whip, as Lib-Labs. But tutored as he and Attlee were by Tory Churchill, the supposed strong and independent policy of Ernest Bevin and the third Labour Government could not untruthfully be described as Tory-Lab. A Tory-Lab foreign policy, a Tory-Lab armaments and financial policy—this is what hung like a millstone round the neck of the Labour Government from its very outset in November, 1964.

In the disillusionment and cold critical surveys that followed the devaluation of November 18 this was made clear enough in *The Times* by its defence correspondent who wrote:

> By and large the present Government have accepted all the political obligations and strategic premises of their predecessors. . . . The other obligations remain intact as they were inherited . . .

and again he wrote:

> Britain under the Conservatives had a global strategy consonant with certain imperial obligations which had not been or could not be wound up, and the principle of intervention on an almost global scale was accepted. The Labour Government's strategy is more or less within the same framework. . . . The policy of deterrence, nuclear and conventional, remains. (*The Times*, December 4, 1967.)

So not only the armaments, the global strategy, the bases for ships and landing stages for bomber planes, but also the atomic weapons are all one and the same policy, inherited from the Tories—and linked up with the corresponding policy of the United States of America.

Ally or Satellite?

But the matter does not end with a mere 'linkage' with the USA. The Defence Correspondent (who is Charlie Douglas-Home, younger brother of the one-time Earl) pursues his theme and tells of 'another paradox which arises from Britain's economic predicament'. He tells how

> 'fear of losing American support for Britain's economy has apparently been enough to persuade the Government to adopt global policies in line with an Anglo-American alliance in areas outside Europe. This paradox is further underlined by the fact that in order to carry out these policies, Britain has to purchase American aircraft which will involve balance of payments outgoings which can only further aggravate the original economic malaise.'

And after explaining that the Defence Establishment is 'certainly too large' but also 'so dissipated that we have to rely on American

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

help' to give the required equipment or support 'in almost every sphere of our effort', the Defence Correspondent goes on to say:

> 'The Government, like their Conservative predecessors, seem still to be seduced by our imperial past, with Washington surprisingly willing to assist in the seduction.' (*The Times*, December 4, 1967.)

What bemuses Douglas-Home need cause no surprise to readers of this magazine. The old Anglo-American antagonism has long ago given place to very different situations: first the 'special relationship' against which President de Gaulle keeps declaiming (*les anglo-saxons*) and girding up the loins of the French Republic; and, secondly, the phasing out from this into a subordination, a relation of deference to one's superior, a relation of client to patron, and finally, of master-and-servant. This was first registered when Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, in his paranoiac hatred of Communism and Communist countries, succumbed to the United States' proposal to keep some of their bomber and naval bases (the later outcome being Polaris in the Holy Loch) upon British soil. At the time Winston Churchill asked if there had been no *quid pro quo*: for the thought of Yankee-doodle-dandy crowing it over here perturbed even the susceptibilities of the half-Yank son of Jennie Jerome. But no, Bevin in peace time had surrendered some of this country's sovereignty to what sentimental scribblers used to call 'our Anglo-Saxon cousins': and George Brown is the lineal successor of Ernest Bevin. The whole new relationship, with Britain as a satrapy in the dominions of the Almighty Dollar, has more aspects than can be gone into fully here. But there are two glaring results of it which must be dealt with: and the first of these is Vietnam.

Deaf Ears in Downing Street

Only one aspect need be raised now at this late hour in South East Asian history. That is the contrast between the complaisant attitude of the Labour Government and the indignation felt elsewhere—not only amongst the people of Britain but as voiced by the heads of state and personages in similar positions of authority throughout the world. Outside the fascist countries and the client states of the USA there is scarcely one who has not uttered words of protest, either before or after the head of the French Republic summarily denounced this as *sale guerre* ('filthy war'). Five months ago, U Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations stated:

> 'I regard the continuation of the war in Vietnam as being totally unnecessary . . . I am convinced that the war cannot be brought to an end until the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States and her allies recognise that it is being fought by the Vietnamese, not as a war of communist aggression, but as a *war of national independence*.' (July 30, 1967.)

This was the utterance of the man who from his position may be looked upon as hoping to voice a more universal opinion than even the heads of churches: but his voice fell upon deaf ears in Downing Street. Five weeks later by a majority of a million and a third votes, the Trades Union Congress passed the following resolution:

'Congress calls upon the British Government to dissociate itself from American policy in Vietnam and to make every effort, based on the 1954 Geneva Agreements, to bring about an end to the present war with a view to implementing the "no foreign troops" and "national-wide elections" clauses in the 1954 Agreement.'

It was moved by Jim Mortimer for the Draughtsmen and carried by 4,686,000 against 3,319,000 (September 5, 1967). The Trades Union Congress is highly regarded when the General Council is complacent towards the Government and treated with disdainful silence when it criticises. For not a word was uttered by the spokesmen of the British Government. They had stopped their ears.

Lastly, from within the USA itself comes a succession of voices and amongst them in the first week of December the voice of Senator Fulbright, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. From his position of great authority he denounced the war with arguments to which only dollar-stuffed ears in Downing Street could fail to respond.

The Vietnam Massacres

In Vietnam imperialist aggression in its big business development is now naked and displayed in all its horrors. The use of bombs as a means of exterminating men, women and children indiscriminately is not civilised warfare. It was, in the 19th century, the method employed by the Ottoman Turks against disturbances within their Empire among subject nationalities or religious groups. Turkish armed forces including the notorious Bashi-Bazouks (forerunners of the Black-and-Tans in Ireland or the SS of Hitlerite Germany) would march into a village in Macedonia, Bulgaria or another part of the Balkans and indiscriminately slaughter the inhabitants. There were great meetings of protest here. The Liberal leader, and four times Prime Minister, W. E. Gladstone, carried out famous cam-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paigns against the Bulgarian atrocities of 1876 and the Armenian atrocities of 1894-95-96. There are similar or worse atrocities now in Vietnam. But the mealy-mouthed politicians and publicists shrink from naming them as massacres. Seventy years ago and more it was possible in this island for foul massacres to be denounced fearlessly. The preacher in the City Temple, Dr. Joseph Parker, could raise his voice against Sultan Abdul Hamid and fix upon him the indelible title of Abdul the Damned. Gladstone at the age of 86 could tour the country and write his pamphlet against Armenian massacres: but the Prime Minister of today seems to lack the necessary moral fibre. The feeling of peace-loving peoples as well as pleas from representatives of the working class are all ignored. Yet, as was voiced semi-judicially by Jean-Paul Sartre on December 1 in Copenhagen, it is known that these massacres are an abomination, that the US Government is guilty of genocide and that the provisions worked out at Nuremberg for war crimes are applicable to those responsible. Those who exterminated all but a handful of Red Indians in North America seem now bent on exterminating by massacre the peoples of what was once called the East Indies and is now broadly known as Indo-China. But the Prime Minister of Britain and the Foreign Secretary appear not to have a decent regard for the opinions of mankind. For they can bring themselves to utter accents of approval for a US government whose troops, as a great American publicist in Britain two months ago remarked, 'use terror and torture as a regular part of army methods'.

The Greater Danger

What we call the link-up with the USA, actually the subordination of Britain to transatlantic finance capital (and now showing itself, as recent publication of the Labour Research Department reveals, over ever wider sectors of British industry) is diplomatically formulated in a series of treaties. Such treaties are the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) together with the South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) with CENTO in between covering part of the Middle East. Primarily, these treaties are military alliances. They are designed to come fully into operation in the event of war. Meantime, inter-allied training (the Germans in uniform in Pembroke) goes forward. They were conceived after the Truman Doctrine 'for the containment of Communism' which was promulgated in 1947. Nato was formed in 1948 and is twenty years old; SEATO in 1954. These treaties could be brought into action, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quite suddenly. Their existence, the ranging of some thirty states as subordinate allies of the USA is put forward together with atomic weaponry as a deterrent. But equally it could be regarded as a continued war provocation—especially as Nato embraces West Germany whose state policy is for revenge and revision of frontiers with no considerable means of carrying this through except by renewal of war. This then is the second and even more serious aspect of 'the link' of Britain with the USA: and this aspect has become more menacing recently so that this year, 1968, might well become a crucial year not only for Europe, but for mankind. This is the greater danger that confronts us now in 1968.

At Ease on Etna

There are some who, while accepting the general hazards implicit in war alliances, consider that the risk of war is now very much diminished. Etna, they admit, is a volcano and slightly active from time to time; but, they say, villagers for centuries have been living unharmed on its slopes. The more the regular rumble of the volcano is heard the more people will be alerted and the less likelihood is there of a violent catastrophe. Each smaller tremor, they say, relieves the tension and lessens the risks of general war. It is a singular fallacy based on a misreading of historical events.

What happened in 1914 at the outbreak of the First World War was preceded by a whole series of lesser wars. In 1911, Italy made war on Turkey, and seized its African dependencies with the Dodecanese in the Aegean Sea. The first Balkan war began on October 8, 1912; the second Balkan war on June 29, 1913; and was over in a matter of weeks. Events like the Arab-Israeli war, even shorter than the second Balkan war, cannot be considered to have relieved the tension. On the contrary, the tension is greater now than it was a year ago. It was not for nothing that Marshal Grechko reviewing the Moscow military parade on November 7 pointed out the danger of war arising from American imperialism operating in Vietnam and from West Germany's policy of revenge. Just as U Thant's indication that we were on the very brink of a third world war has been smothered up, so this warning from the Soviet Union as well as the addition to its defence budget seems to have passed unheeded. An acuter awareness of the hazards in the present international situation and greater readiness to expose and combat the warmongers must be a main task of the British people within the months ahead in 1968. The warning must be heeded.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Character from Pickwick Papers

In the last fifteen years it was quite usual for Ministers of the Crown visiting Moscow to tell on their return, with a self-satisfied chuckle, how they had at last convinced the Russians that the England of Charles Dickens no longer existed—and so showed a blissful ignorance of their own resemblance to some of Dickens' characters. Even the present Government can present an array of visages that recall the famous Cruikshank illustrations. Who, looking upon their frequent faces in *The Times* or the *Express* or the *Mirror*, is not faintly reminded of Mr. Gradgrind or Mr. Micawber, the Reverend Stiggins or the Artful Dodger, Mr. Picksniff or Uriah Heap or even Mrs. Gamp? But beyond all others, the Minister of Labour showing his face on the TV screen immediately recalls the Fat Boy in Pickwick Papers. Remember the Fat Boy bellowing in the ear of Mr. Wardle's aunt the fearful words: 'I wants to make your flesh creep.' Remember Mr. Gunter's portentous announcement in mid-October that 'There is a Communist plot to disrupt the industries of this country'. And then on October 18 remember Gunter plunging into a docks strike discussion at Downing Street—only to have his bubble pricked by Frank Cousins on the very doorstep of No. 10.

He did not seem to know that his 'Red Plot' had been the stock-in-trade of bankrupt politicians for many a long year. Just 60 years ago the 'Red Plot' was so mercilessly satirised in the lambent prose of Anatole France's *Penguin Island*, that any statesman who thereafter employed this device stood thereby self-condemned.

Only One Paper Supports Strikers

Then on November 27 Gunter appears to have heard that drivers of the railway engines felt a grievance on which they were going to take action. So he immediately bawled out that a strike would be 'the silliest of the decade'. Did nobody tell him that his whole Ministry, being an outgrowth from the Department of Conciliation set up 70 years ago by the act of 1896, depends for its effectiveness on the minister never appearing to take sides and therefore learning to keep his mouth shut—all the more when it turned out that the trouble arose from the folly of the Railway Board and the Transport Ministry in discussing guards on the locomotives without even consulting the union of the locomotive men. Nevertheless the explanation of this (and similar outbursts by George Brown) lies deeper than the idiosyncrasies of ministers. These things would not have happened

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had there not been an atmosphere in this Cabinet for over two years of 'get tough with the unions'. Hence the threats to pass new laws to muzzle the unions and to penalise unofficial strikes. Indeed it is now axiomatic in times of crisis that the effort to lay the burden on the working class will be accompanied first by denunciations and then by repressive measures against all those who do not submissively accept the lowering of the standard of living. So was it with the dockers on strike at London and in Liverpool. Against them every organ of denunciation, vilification, abuse, slander and offensive hysteria was turned on full blast. The whole orchestra, every daily paper in the land—except the *Morning Star*—joined in the denunciation.

Democracy in Danger

Amid all the denunciations of the dockers and in particular Jack Dash, 'the dockers' unofficial leader', there is one obvious comment that never seems to have been made and one most obvious question that everyone studiously avoided raising. How is it that the trade unionist Jack Dash can be regarded as the dockers' leader, and at the same time is never elected by the dockers as their official trade union leader?* Why is he only their 'unofficial trade union leader'? Yet the answer to this question is staring them in the face. Jack Dash is elected, and yet he is not elected. Why? Because the rules of the great Transport and General Workers Union to which he belongs are not democratic rules. A democratic body that works by election gives full electoral rights to every member. Just as every adult citizen in Britain is entitled to a vote, so every member of the union by all the canons of democracy must be so entitled. There must be no distinction of sex or colour, political or religious beliefs. This is one of the fundamental doctrines of British democracy as it has grown up in struggles carried out over many generations. Yet the rules of this great union some quarter of a century ago were so altered as to deprive its members of their fundamental rights to elect whomever they chose to be their representative officials, their secretaries, their leaders.

Caesarism

This, it is well known, was the mutilation of democracy carried out in his heyday by Ernest Bevin—the much boosted Bevin who both

* Last month when there was a free election in the London Docks (i.e when all the workers—of whatever union—had full right to vote) Jack Dash was immediately elected shop steward.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

within the trade union movement and within the sphere of foreign policy wrought much evil for the people of this country. In the trade union movement his overweening ambition and drive towards Caesarism enabled him to put forward a plan by which elections were largely limited to the executive, while actual power within the union would be concentrated in the hands of a few headquarters officials, the Caesars of the union, whose nominees would almost invariably be accepted by the part-time executive committee. It was an ingenious example of a military-type of organisation applied to trade unionism. In effect, it meant a despotic tendency within the union, a tendency which was if anything enhanced under his successor Deakin and has remained till now. Today a man with a different outlook, more of a democrat and more of a socialist, is now chief official: but even Frank Cousins has not been democratic enough to be able to initiate and carry through the rescue of the Transport and General Workers Union from its own undemocratic constitution.

Better Forms of Democracy

Not only was the Labour Movement, comprising the socialists and the trade unions, always in the very forefront of the struggle for democracy, for the rights of workers as citizens without distinction of age, sex, race, colour, religion or politics, but it was always in favour of the more advanced forms of democracy. Whatever criticisms they made of existing democratic forms was not in order to get a reversion to despotism, autocracy, caesarism or paternalism, but towards a greater degree of democracy and a wider application of it. It was towards the best and most advanced methods, for example in Parliamentary elections and trade union elections, that the Labour movement was striving. For example, they sought in single member constituencies with a plurality of candidates to avoid the absurdity of an MP being returned by a minority (perhaps only 33 per cent) of the votes cast. Then the strivings of the workers inside their trade unions for democracy and the best form (thoroughly analysed and described in the Webbs' *Industrial Democracy* published in 1898) went a step further. Twenty years later the Miners' Federation adopted a new system of election carried out in the case of the first election by the Proportional Representation Society itself to ensure that the most perfect method would be properly applied. In the same year 1918 the Representation of the People Bill provided for the same principle in parliamentary elections: but this was rejected by the House of Lords. But then Ramsay MacDonald and the Labour

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Party Chiefs, having seen themselves as a possible alternative government on the old imperfect electoral method, turned their backs on any better method. Thus apart from the attainment of Women Suffrage the process towards a more effective democratic method within the existing system was brought to a halt over 40 years ago.

Ebb-tide of Democracy

Then within the trade union movement there began to develop a retrogressive attitude towards democracy. Equal rights for women were accorded only very grudgingly and the full implementation was not yet effectively secured. Equal rights for coloured people remained something to which lip-service at any rate was given. But in the case of no distinction of politics or creed, there set in after 1925 a period of black reaction within the trade unions, a period of black circulars when the rights of trade unionists were being whittled away. Then came the further step after the war when, with Ernie Bevin in the lead, several unions mutilated themselves rather than submit to the usual democratic electoral processes. It was not only the Transport and General Workers Union: for example, in the Clerical and Administrative Workers Union Communists are treated differently from other members of the union. Even the Women's Co-operative Guild, at one time an advanced organisation which showed the possibility of further advance and help to the women of this country to have their full rights, was self-mutilated in this way. Lastly came the decision that no Communist could be a full-time official of the Electrical Trades Union. The electricians of this country have to become second-class citizens within their own organisation, deprived of their own rights.

The checkweigher in the coalmines, the Father of the Chapel in the printing trades, the shop steward found that under conditions of monopoly capitalism they were more and more hindered in their functions. Those who are growing up now will find that they have to fight for democracy within the trade union movement. Democracy and all that goes with civil rights become increasingly restricted and harassed by the powers of monopoly. It is one of the singular merits of the Congress of the Communist Party at the end of November that it should have pin-pointed the danger of monopoly to democracy. Monopoly capitalism is the modern enemy of democracy.

Fight for Democracy at Home and Abroad

Thus the coming year will see an increasingly sharp fight to maintain democracy, to restore it and to prevent it from being

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

driven back. It is a fight of the same order as that which is celebrated in the school books. In England it was the fight against the Test Acts and all other acts which strove to restrict civil and religious liberties. It was the fight for complete toleration and, in 20th century phraseology, the fight to put an end to second-class citizenship. Second-class citizenship for some means that others in the organisation do not have full citizens' rights. Anybody in a union should be allowed to cast their vote without restriction: for otherwise democracy is poisoned at the very grass roots of its growth.

This struggle for democracy within the trade union movement in Britain has its complement outside Britain. The struggle for democracy which had a great measure of success in the national liberation movement is now in various parts of the world halted or driven back. This has happened both in Africa and in Asia, in South America and in North America while the re-emergence of fascism in Greece is seen. Democracy abroad is faced this year with counter-revolution and with fascism. But nevertheless, there is the consciousness growing through the continents that unless there is more and more democracy, unless democracy is implemented by economic liberation, full independence and free development will not result. Within Britain there is still a struggle for democracy, as there has to be for socialism, and before all for peace.

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

The British workers are long-suffering, but there is apparently a limit to their patience. The policy of consistent and persistent surrender to capitalism, and collaboration with it, might have passed off well enough in an age of expanding capitalism, such as Britain passed through from 1850 to 1870, or such as the United States has been passing through since the war. In such a period the capitalist class can confer enough privileges upon the upper 'aristocracy' of labour, and from time to time make sufficient concessions to groups of the mass of workers, to make class collaboration worth while.

But nowadays there is less and less of such a material basis for the propaganda and practice of the united front with Baldwin. Wages, hours and condtions, in industry after industry, are being attacked. The last two years have hastened this process. And the workers are having their eyes opened by hard facts to the need for an anti-capitalist policy and a sound anti-capitalist organisation. It was natural that their eyes should turn first of all to the Labour Party and to the trade union officialdom which is associated with the Labour Party. However, we have seen that, on every vital issue during 1927, the whole reformist Labour leadership more and more openly and cynically abandoned the workers' interests.

(From 'The Left Wing in 1928', by Andrew Rothstein, *Labour Monthly*, January 1928.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE McQUILKIN INTERVIEW

(The Tories, the capitalist press, the spokesmen of Big Business and some Labour leaders are openly calling for the curbing of trade union activity, especially in the workshop. This attack on the rights of trade unionists was initiated two years ago when Mr. Wilson described militant union members as 'wreckers'.

The following extract from an interview with Bill McQuilkin, Paisley District Secretary of the AEU, televised on the BBC Television programme 'Twenty-Four Hours' on October 25, 1965, *is therefore of particular significance*—Ed., LM.)

Michael Barratt: (at Pressed Steel Gate):	I asked workers outside the factories what they thought of McQuilkin.
1st Worker:	I think he is out for the Communist Party —for his own good—not for the workers.
2nd Worker:	As long as he does his job what we think he should do. We think he is all right.
3rd Worker:	He is a very good man on the job. He knows the job. I have had contact with him before. He has done a good job as far as I am concerned.
Michael Barratt:	You don't think he is a 'wrecker'?
3rd Worker:	Pardon?
Michael Barratt:	You don't think he is a 'wrecker'?
3rd Worker:	No, he is not a 'wrecker'. This is a name that is bandied about probably by people who don't know any better.
4th Worker:	He is a Communist. As long as he does for the workers—as long as he does all right for the workers I think he is a good man for the AEU.
5th Worker:	I think he does his job very successfully. I won't say he is always right. There are times they are wrong but generally I think he does his job very successfully.
Michael Barratt: (Film Shot of AEU Paisley District Committee Meeting)	Party and Union loyalties are sometimes hard to distinguish, especially as many members of McQuilkin's Union District Committee carry Party cards.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Michael Barratt: (to W. McQuilkin in interview at home) What view comes first? Your Communism or your Trade Unionism?

W. McQuilkin: Well, you see, our Union, the AEU, is a democratic body. It has annual conferences. It decides on policy. In addition to that, we have rules, and it is the policy decisions democratically taken by the Union in annual conference, and the rules of the Union, that determine my reactions as issues evolve.

Michael Barratt: But the Communist Party has rules too, and these you must obey.

W. McQuilkin: The Communist Party is a democratic organisation too, and they respect the decisions of all other bodies, such as trade unions.

Michael Barratt: This means, does it, that you are a Marxist rather than a Trotskyite?

W. McQuilkin: Oh, absolutely, I am a Marxist, and am not a Trotskyite.

Michael Barratt: Well, can I quote to you from the *Daily Worker*? It is in your own cuttings book, actually: 'What a mean, low-down scurvying, snivelling, lot of sneaking narks these Clydeside bosses must be'. Are these your sentiments, too?

W. McQuilkin: You're not quoting me?

Michael Barratt: No, I am quoting the *Daily Worker*.

W. McQuilkin: Oh, yes, yes.

Michael Barratt: And I am saying, are those, too, your sentiments? Do you share them?

W. McQuilkin: Well, I cannot recall having read that, you see. The thought behind those remarks, yes, I would agree, but possibly use more courteous language, shall we say—*(smiling)*.

Michael Barratt: So, you find it impossible, then to like or respect an employer?

W. McQuilkin: As an employer, yes. Absolutely. I neither like nor respect them—as employers.

Michael Barratt: It is a case of us and them and a line that you will never cross and never want to cross!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. McQuilkin: Oh yes, as far as I am concerned, yes.

Michael Barratt: I wonder why.

W. McQuilkin: Because they represent all, as a matter of fact, they are responsible for the low wages, bad working conditions, and the threats of unemployment that especially face the Scottish workers, especially the West of Scotland. They represent all that.

Michael Barratt: You don't honestly expect reasonable and intelligent people to accept that all wrong is on one side, and all right on the other, do you?

W. McQuilkin: No, I couldn't say that. I couldn't say that. But what I am saying is the employers own and control industry, and therefore, they must assume *major—major* responsibility for all that happens in that industry.

Michael Barratt: But you are a very powerful man, don't you accept the very big responsibilities, as you put it, to keep the machines turning, and to prevent strikes, if possible?

W. McQuilkin: Well, I would doubt that very much, Mr. Barratt, thanks for saying so, that I am a powerful man. I never visualised myself as such. I simply carry out the policy of the Union, the policy of my District Committee, and in that way, represent my members.

Michael Barratt: All right. Well, I will put this to you in a different way. Don't you think it is the responsibility of a Union to keep the machines turning?

W. McQuilkin: But they do. They do. The machines, for instance, are turning all right in this district at this moment. I don't know of any machines that are not turning. But men, if I may say so, don't come out on strike, is that what you have in mind?

Michael Barratt: Eh, eh.

W. McQuilkin: Don't come out on strike just for the sake of coming out on strike. Just for the sake of stopping the machines.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Michael Barratt: The Prime Minister recently castigated 'wreckers' in industry. He said that they bring about unofficial disputes, and disrupt production. When he said this, I wonder if you felt his finger pointing at you?

W. McQuilkin: As a matter of fact, he wasn't pointing it at me. He definitely indicated shop stewards. He used the term shop stewards, and I emphatically deny his assertion. Indeed, many of these shop stewards worked very hard to bring about the return of a Labour Government. His Government. And there is a growing resentment amongst the shop stewards against the thought that he expressed on that occasion.

Michael Barratt: A lot of people think you are a 'wrecker', of course. Does this make you angry?

W. McQuilkin: Do they? No, it does not make me angry. It makes me desire to have the opportunity to express my points of view, which is not given to me, when these kind of things are said by certain press organs.

1968—WILL IT BRING PEACE IN VIETNAM?

Norman Atkinson, MP

'*The battle is being fought to enable the people of South Vietnam to choose their own future in their own way. All my sympathy goes to all those who are suffering as a consequence of this bloody war. The tragic fact is that it could easily give way to negotiation if only we could get a response from Hanoi to any of the reasonable and honourable proposals made from many quarters.*' George Brown speaking at the SEATO Ministerial Council Meeting, Washington, April 18, 1967.

WHY won't Hanoi and the National Liberation Front behave decently and negotiate? The short answer is disarmingly simple: to do so whilst the bombing of North Vietnam continues—or even following a brief pause in the bombing—would be tantamount

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to capitulation, therefore totally unacceptable to a proud nation whose fight for liberation stretches over two decades.

And, secondly, it is not a question of getting agreement between the Northern and Southern halves of a country—far from it—it is a matter of securing a transitionary arrangement between the two halves of the Southern piece. That is, between Saigon and the NLF.

If the Americans would stop their bombing of the North for a long period with the objective of creating a North-South stalemate—and if they are willing to recognise that the essential agreement to be reached is between the quarrelling two halves in the South—there is ample confirmation that Premier Pham Van Dong and Nguyen Huu Tho, Chairman of the NLF, will eventually sit down alongside Dean Rusk and come to terms with the Thieu-Ky Administration.

As it is, it is little short of arrant nonsense for President Johnson to keep up his murderous aggression against the North whilst reiterating the Pentagon slogan '. . . show us some real live Cong around a table and we'll negotiate any time any place'.

Moreover, it is even worse for George Brown and the Prime Minister to be seen giving credence to this ruse when they should, as joint guardians of the Geneva Agreement, be publicly dissociating themselves from the bombing of the North and joining with the Soviet Union in trying to work out a basis for meaningful peace talks.

In fact, now is the time for the Prime Minister to again visit the United States determined to put right our pathetic record of acquiescence; irrespective of possible economic difficulties which could arise as a result. The situation is now so critical it has become imperative for Britain to speak out loud and clear. Otherwise Britain will lose for ever the remaining respect which still exists for us throughout the radical peace movement now sweeping across the United States.

Why has the situation become so critical, knowing it is now almost three years since the bombing of North Vietnam first started? The military position has not dramatically changed, yet America's Generals have suddenly become impatient and anxious to step-up the war. Why?

Could it be that 1968 is Presidential year in the United States when LBJ, together with one-third of the Senate are due for re-election? Or could it be that one-third of the electorate, Democrats and Republicans alike, have opted to ignore party tickets and plump for a 'Peace' candidate? Or does it mean they are feared that the President

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will go all-out to start negotiations, thus spiking the guns of his opponents and easing things for himself?

Undoubtedly the situation is unique in political history. Here is the world's most powerful nation, excruciatingly at war with one of the weakest, ostensibly going to the polls to elect a President, but in reality voting to decide whether or not the war should continue.

Practically everyone, from the President to the youngest elector, knows that neither Ho nor the United States can win a military victory—even if the war lasts another decade. Yet Johnson seems compelled to stagger on hopefully rather than order a decisive bombing stop. Were he to do so, his 'Hawkish' advisers say, he would invite history to christen him the first American president to have lost a war. Alternatively, in continuing the war he must fully realise the odds-on likelihood of his losing the Democrat re-nomination and later, even if over that hurdle, of being rejected by the cost-conscious American people. Which then is it to be? My guess is that he will do everything possible to be seen negotiating a settlement around June or July this year. But in saying that, no one should underestimate the immense dangers which lie ahead. A lot could go wrong.

The Pentagon is calling for blood. Like all military advisers the world over they are incapable of thinking non-military solutions. They react to situations in a most subjective way. The most senior Generals who have a ready ear in the President are now saying that if Johnson is to get the Vietnamese leaders softened-up and to the conference table in time for it to mollify the hostile American electorate, then the war must be escalated now. The bombing must be increased to the point of saturation and the North Vietnamese ports obliterated. Anti-personnel strategies must be intensified and US troops must be allowed to cross into North Vietnam. Some go even further and publicly state that the US must not be too squeamish about a few bombs landing on Chinese territory.

The world consequences of such a strategy are horrifying, yet they coolly continue their demands with an aloofness known only to the demented.

Take the case of Mr. McNamara. Mild-mannered though he is, certainly no 'dove'. Mr. McNamara was Denis Healey's opposite number and no doubt suffered the same military pressures from his advisers. Some little time ago General Westmoreland put in a chit for a 90,000-strong Vietnam draft. McNamara resisted and agreed to only 45,000. The Generals stiffened. McNamara went further:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opposed the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong and proved that still heavier bombing would not win the war. The Generals exploded. Dean Rusk intervened with a multi-billion dollar plan for massive anti-ballistic missile defences against future Chinese nuclear attack. Again the Defence Secretary was not impressed. He had to go.

(Mr. McNamara, having been appointed President of the World Bank, no doubt will now have the opportunity of studying the effects of the Vietnam war on world trade. His recommendations should prove interesting.)

The point is—the Generals won. They unquestionably have tremendous power, but does this mean they will be able to frustrate the possibility of an extended bombing pause? I hope not. In my opinion the US opinion polls are now swinging so decisively against the war that Johnson will look to his electoral chances and be marginally influenced in favour of resisting Pentagon demands for escalation. However, the US peace movement must be on guard against the plea—'Just one more escalation and we're home'.

The great test will come at the end of the Tet bombing pause already agreed to start on January 27 till February 2. This is the period to cover the Vietnamese New Year celebrations. If President Johnson can be persuaded to hold off resumption of the bombing indefinitely I am convinced the reciprocation they ask will be forthcoming. But let us not be kidded by the Generals claiming, as they have done before during short breaks in the bombing, that the movement of essential food supplies for NLF forces and encircled villages constitutes advantage to Ho and, therefore, good reason to resume the bombing. President Johnson himself has said it has never been US policy in South Vietnam to starve the villagers even though they may be sympathetic to the NLF.

The hope and shape of things to come in S.E. Asia depend not on military operations in Vietnam but on the outcome of political events in the USA. The fact that the US Defence Budget is now some £37,500 million is having widespread repercussions. The Administration has this year suffered a £1,200 million deficit and in consequence the President has called for a 10 per cent tax surcharge. Not a popular thing for any government to do. Add to that the mounting Vietnam casualty lists which regularly appear each morning in the press and on TV, the realisation that the campaign against poverty and urban renewal is rapidly receding, and one can easily understand why the opinion polls, which are causing such gloom in the White House, are continuing to record growing discontent with the war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let's face it! The fact that many leading American politicians derive their courage from favourable opinion polls and not from personally-held principles, is a sad reflection. None the less it is true; and explains why there are so many late band-waggoners from both parties. Of the internal challengers to President Johnson it will be Eugene McCarthy, a Democrat Senator of twenty years standing and outstanding liberal reputation, who will make the running. The other favourite, Senator Robert Kennedy, will, I believe, remain in the wings keeping his eye on 1972. A premature move now will rob him of an almost certain Democrat nomination in four years time.

On the Republican front, prediction is not so easy. The party managers are looking for a 'Peace' candidate. Messrs. Reagan, Romney and Nixon are all known 'Hawks'. Governor Romney was the first 'to throw his hat in the ring' with his statement, 'I was brain-washed by the Generals', thereby naïvely qualifying for instant recognition as a 'Dove' convert. Richard Nixon may be the next to qualify and perhaps will come up with an ingenious repeat of Eisenhower's 'Peace in Korea' campaign.

Whichever way it goes it seems very likely that the American electorate are going to be left with no alternative but to vote for a 'Stop the war' candidate of some sort, whether it is the retiring President himself, or a new Democrat, a Republican, or a Socialist.

However, the most encouraging aspect of the American scene as I see it is the shift of opinion within the trade unions towards a more progressive internationalism. Organisationally it is still embryonic but the very fact that trade unionists are coming together to discuss international affairs, and Vietnam in particular, shows an awakening conscience.

Of course the cynics will again dismiss these moves as the first real signs that Vietnam and the pile-up of nuclear weapons is biting into the living standards of American workers. But to my mind there is more to it than that. There has never before been a time when the American people have been so openly sceptical of the methods, the purposes and the aims of their own Government while actively engaged in war. Many outstanding national leaders of the AFL-CIO are now taking an active part in the Trade Union Division of SANE (National Committee for a sane nuclear policy). Men like Alf Hartung, Emil Mazey, Pat Gorman, and Frank Rosenblum, are giving powerful anti-war leadership at this most crucial time in American history. British trade unionists should salute them and do everything possible to help.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GREETINGS

from the

EDITOR AND STAFF

of

SOVIET WEEKLY

in colour **Thursdays** **Sixpence**

January 4th: *"The Soviet Manager" . . . socialist and capitalist industrial executives compared*

Look out for two vital articles in the February

LABOUR MONTHLY

BETTY AMBATIELOS writes on the GREEK CRISIS

DILIP BOSE writes on the struggle for the restoration of democracy in West Bengal, following the dismissal of the United Front Government

Make sure of getting your LM regularly by taking out a year's subscription NOW

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Self-portrait

The above lithographs are by Käthe Kollwitz (1867-1945), the great
Bethnal Green Museum.

'I want to work for the people of our own age', she wrote. Käthe K
long-desired brotherhood of man'. Her creative sympathy has made her

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fallen

With acknowledgments to the Deutscher Kunstrat

ı artist, an exhibition of whose works was recently held at the London

lived and worked to achieve a socialism in action, 'understood as the the most humane figures of our time.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ARTS TODAY

Edited by Stuart Douglass

A DECLARATION OF INTENT

by an Actor

Tony Selby. Married, one child, daughter, eighteen months. Born February, 1938, son of London taxi-driver Sam Selby. Mother one of a family of fifteen children; Dad one of twelve. Both large working-class cockney families quite well known in Westminster area.

Started entertaining with the other kids in the buildings where I lived at the end of the Second World War at the age of seven. We used to entertain wounded soldiers in London hospitals singing, dancing, etc. Educated state primary and secondary modern school, was offered grammar school place at thirteen but turned it down because was enjoying co-education, and not having too much trouble getting away to work professionally as a child (not precocious) actor. Started having a couple of classes a week at Italia Conti Stage School at the age of eleven and continued with this outside State school hours until the age of fifteen.

First professional job was Curly in Peter Pan, Christmas 1950, at the age of twelve. Various work on T.V. and stage, etc. as child. First interesting play as late teenager in 'The Quare Fellow' at Theatre Workshop, 1956. Last theatre performance that mattered in 'Saved' at the Royal Court Theatre, 1965. Only actor to my knowledge to have played the leading roles in nine Wednesday Plays. Of these most remembered are 'Tap on the Shoulder', 'Three Clear Sundays', 'Up the Junction', 'Silent Song', 'Another Day, Another Dollar' and 'The Devil a Monk Would Be'.

WHAT'S it all about, this acting game? How long have I been at it now? Oh, about eighteen years man and boy. So how does one start to write about it? I mean how do you put pen to paper? Son of a London cab driver, or as the old man would say, an informed welfare-educated peasant's son.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now you sit down with me over a pint (avoiding Barbara) of beer and I'll talk to you about it all. I can't write it down, but I'll argue all night long with anyone about things that really matter—the homeless, the unemployed, strikers unofficial, poverty, wealth, America in Vietnam, war equals poverty equals war equals poverty equals wealth.

Ah! you say to me, yes but! what is acting all about? Well, I'll say to you swigging me beer, first of all it's about all that lot of things I've just mentioned. Why? Because if you do not know the reasons and causes for the villainy perpetrated against your fellow man, and particularly if *you don't want to know* then go and grow turnips. Why bother to ask about acting? It's not important enough for you to bother about. You have to care before you can communicate and if you're not involved it doesn't matter, eh? I mean, really, people in show-biz shouldn't get involved in politics and arguments, should they? They're only there for entertainment after all, aren't they?

Seriously though, what is the use of all the acting classes, etc., that so many parents send their children to? As soon as the kid says, 'Here Mum, what they done to that songwriter in Greece', Mum shrinks off into a corner muttering, 'Learn your Shakespeare, dear, and get your Gold Medal and then you'll be on the tellybox. Don't worry yourself with politics'.

Well, I say to any student of the arts (what a word), go out among people, have a pint in any boozer, go to football (and do your Shakespeare) matches. You see, it's all very basic, never mind all the intellectuals who chit-chat away givin' it Noddy on any given subject, then going round in ever-decreasing circles finally disappearing up their own nostrils. People are sick to death of all that garbage. Vietnam belongs to the Vietnamese, not the Americans, argument finished—you know what I mean?

We've always had slums and unemployment. Immoral, isn't it? Absolutely. Right, well eradicate it from society, don't get me four professors intellectualising all night long about National Assistance and Halfway Houses and the Welfare State. It's all cobblers, we all pay for it till we're in pawn up to our necks. How long will people stand for it? I don't know (Oh, keep reading your Shakespeare, student of the arts) but there's one racing certainty. Harold the Wizard of 'Ampstead Jardin Suburb is as likely to solve these problems as those who have gone before him.

What's that you say to me? What's all this got to do with being an actor? For myself I'd say *everything*. But what's acting all about,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what makes an actor? I don't know. But after listening to what I've had to say you can go home and listen to your LP of Sir John or Sir Ralph, then you can switch on your telly and watch swinging stimulating Simon Dee (Pies, you Burk) brought to you at the great expense of Auntie BBC or take a trip with £.S.D. on the never-never. Then after all that you might decide what it's all about. Meanwhile I'll get out me little yellow card, go down the Labour and sign on—again.

Yours for want of the rent and a good part.

TONY SELBY (*actor*)

A HAPPY NEW YEAR AND A RESOLUTION

A YEAR ago we started 'The Arts Today', this section of *Labour Monthly*. We said that our aim was that this supplement should be readable, factual and analytical.

As I flick through our first twelve I am surprised at the variety and scope of the subjects we covered.

These included David Frost, the Royal Shakespeare Company, Alice in Wonderland, Charlie Chaplin, Kandinsky, pop music, erotic art, the Irish theatre, television drama, the future of poetry, Unity Theatre, The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists, the film 'Privilege', the Bauhaus, designing the home of the future, Picasso, Marshall MacLuhan, art and the Russian Revolution, ancient Greek drama, the Negro in films, contemporary Cuban art, Sir Malcolm Sargent, Soviet ballet and Soviet cinema today.

It's pretty formidable when you list it like that. More so when you consider that our section is generally restricted to eight pages.

During this period we have introduced a whole new batch of contributors to our columns—such outstanding talents as Peter Watkins, Roger Smith, Adrian Mitchell, Nell Dunn, T. P. McKenna, Jeremy Sandford and Peter Cheeseman.

We wish you a Happy New Year and take this opportunity to restate our aims. We work together to try to bring a wider understanding and appreciation of the Arts to all sections of the Labour Movement so that the true function of the artist in the community can be recognised, respected, encouraged and actively assisted.

We work together to achieve a unity between the Arts themselves and a unity between all artists of the broad Left.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We do not espouse a 'policy for the Arts', other than one which exposes and explodes all obstructions to the full expression of the true artist's instinct to penetrate every crevice and complexity of the conflict of living, and thereby serve humanity to his uttermost capacity.

We thank all our contributors and look forward to any new friends who have a fresh, original statement to make.

We need a wider circulation for our magazine and we ardently request all sections of the Labour Movement to give publicity to our efforts.

We ask equally that artists should interest their colleagues in this new venture.

And of course we ask for cash contributions so that we can extend the scope of our own publicity and increase our pages.

Who knows, perhaps we can then go into colour (let us not lag behind the fashion) with our centre page original work. We hope as well to attract a new cartoonist to make regular contributions.

At the outset of this, our second year, we resolve to be more readable, factual and analytical. With your help we resolve to broaden those areas of understanding, communication and sense of purpose that link the artist with the masses of the people.

1968 is United Nations Human Rights Year. Our special contribution will be a series of articles on the subject of censorship, opening with an analysis by Stephen Sedley of the effects on the British theatre of the abolition of the Lord Chamberlain's office.

Editor of 'The Arts Today'.

THEATRE

Stephen Sedley

CENSORSHIP

TYPICALLY, IT NEEDED eight members of Parliament and eight peers to deliberate solemnly for a year in order to conclude that the head of the Queen's household has no business to be the arbiter of what British theatres are allowed to present on stage. And so, after a delay of only four centuries (with a breather under Cromwell, who made the job redundant by closing the theatres), the Lord Chamberlain's jurisdiction over the stage is about to be abolished on the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Committee on Censorship of the Theatre. This much is certain, though the Home

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secretary is still considering exactly how to plug the gap which will be left when Lord Cobbold returns to paying the royal grocery bills.

One thing which it will mean, and the Committee's report goes to the trouble of spelling it out, is the removal of the political blue pencil which the Lord Chamberlain at present uses to prevent attacks on the heads of friendly foreign powers and to silence assaults on the reputations of respectable public figures alive or dead. No longer, for instance, will poker-faced civil servants on his staff ban a sure line about Mao—'an indoctrinated idiot in a baggy suit'—because they took it to refer to President Johnson; or want to ban a play because it is 'beastly, anti-American and left-wing'; or excise the phrase 'you get on my wick' on the grounds of obscenity. (These were all examples mentioned by the Royal Shakespeare Company in its evidence to the Joint Committee.) But it's a good maxim to fear the Greeks when they bring gifts. What can we expect in place of the Lord Chamberlain?

With regard to obscenity there will almost certainly be an extension of the Obscene Publications Acts 1959 and 1964. The Joint Committee insists that under any such extended law there should be a right of trial by jury (which is only accorded to books where the prosecution chooses to allow it). The recommendation is also made that frivolous prosecutions should be prevented by forbidding the issue of summonses without the leave of the Attorney General. Whether this will prevent the activities of individuals who bring private prosecutions will depend upon who is Attorney General. But at least the playwright, unlike the author at present, will be guaranteed a jury to judge his play.

The dramatist's and producer's headaches, though, do not end here. To begin with, there is always the risk of being sued in civil proceedings by a person who considers himself defamed by a play which either portrays him or contains comments about him. The law is a jealous guardian of reputations.

What is more, the criminal law will step in sometimes where the civil law cannot go and will punish authors (which will include playwrights) for producing writings which attack the dead in a manner which in the view of a court of law might provoke the living into retaliation. This particular jurisdiction has been used in the past to do exactly what the Lord Chamberlain's blue pencil has till now done quietly in the theatre. Truth is no defence. People have in the past been gaoled for attacking the heads of friendly foreign powers—the Tsar in two cases, Marie Antoinette in another, and even Napoleon when he was briefly liked by Britain's rulers.

There are other weapons too in the armoury of cobwebbed criminal offences devised by common law judges in centuries gone by, some of them shelved but none of them scrapped. Blasphemy, for instance, is still a crime, both at common law and under the Blasphemy Act 1697 which stays unrepealed. The courts would not now have the face to permit convictions for such crimes as 'contumeliously reproaching Jesus Christ', denying the existence of God or laughing at the Bible, but there are still no doubt judges of the stamp of Lord Eldon (who refused to enforce copyright in a book which denied that God was a Trinity) who would be glad to dust the old offence down and gaol the odd militant heathen.

Probably the most dangerous of these rusty weapons is the law of sedition. Any acts or words likely in the court's opinion to stir up discontent towards the powers that be or ill-will between different classes of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Queen's subjects constitute a crime carrying an unlimited sentence. Like the law of blasphemy, sedition has been blunted this century by the determined fights which have been put up whenever working-class leaders have been charged with it. Today much of the sting of sedition is incorporated in the Race Relations Act 1965, which is of course being used freely against coloured activists while white racialists as often as not go unpunished. But it is likely that sedition will be dusted down again once the Lord Chamberlain goes. As with criminal libel, truth is no defence. In 1823 a man was convicted of sedition for saying that George III (who was mad) was mad.

Byron's publisher Hunt was convicted of publishing *A Vision of Judgment* 'containing . . . false, scandalous, malicious and defamatory matter of and concerning his late Majesty . . . To the great disgrace and scandal of the memory, reputation and character of the said late King'. Cobbett was convicted of 'devising and intending . . . to insinuate . . . that the people of Ireland were oppressed, aggrieved and injured by our said lord the King's government'. And in 1810 the publishers of the *Morning Chronicle* were charged with publishing an article beginning: 'What a crowd of blessings rush upon one's mind, that might be bestowed upon the country, in the event of a total change of system;' but the jury acquitted them. And it has twice been held that sedition extends to 'any matter tending to possess the people with an ill opinion of the government'. One or two prosecutions for this sort of thing, even if they fail, will put every impresario on the hot line to his lawyer. Where producers used to rail valiantly against the Lord Chamberlain's depredations, discretion will become the better part of valour.

The judiciary is clever enough to see the possibilities of the common law if a situation arises where, for instance, it is deemed necessary to put down a hard-hitting political theatre movement (which God grant us). When the cheers of the liberals have died away listen for the sound of the common law being dragged creaking and groaning into the twentieth century. One thing the Lord Chamberlain's demise is unlikely to produce is greater freedom of expression in the theatre. The law will see to that.

NEW YEAR GREETINGS

to our readers and many friends
from the Editorial board and Staff of

Labour Monthly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WAR PROGRAMME OF GERMAN IMPERIALISM

Quaestor

ON November 12, at Hanover, the German 'National Democratic Party' ended its third annual congress by cheering to the echo—there were some 2,000 delegates—a speech by its chairman Adolf von Thadden, in which he proclaimed that the party's aim was the 're-establishment of the fragmented German Fatherland'—naming Austria as one of the 'fragments' of the 'German area' and calling it an 'invention'.* The whole congress stood to attention as 'Deutschland Uber Alles'—the national anthem under the Kaiser before 1918 and under Hitler from 1933 to 1945—was sung, including the now illegal third verse which described Germany's frontiers as extending from the Meuse to Memel and from the Adige to the Baltic.

In case some of those listening were not strong on geography, von Thadden was more explicit at a press conference afterwards. What he meant, he said, was the unification of the two present German States, Austria, the Sudeten territory taken from Czechoslovakia by the Munich settlement in 1938, South Tyrol (formerly part of Austria, but since 1920 in Italy), and the territories east of the Oder-Neisse line, taken from Germany as ancient Slav lands in 1945 and now part of Poland and the Soviet Union. This expanded Germany, his deputy chairman Wilhelm Gutmann said, was 'the final goal of NDP policy'.

This programme therefore requires (i) the absorption of the German Democratic Republic in the Federal German Republic, (ii) the annexation of territory from Czechoslovakia, Poland and the USSR, (iii) the reannexation of Austria, (iv) the annexation of South Tyrol from Italy.

By treaties of mutual assistance, the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union have pledged one another to give immediate mutual aid if any of them are subjected to military attack. Thus the NDP programme requires the launching of a war of conquest in Eastern Europe. True, the Labour Government in official pronouncements about the Common Market question has made abundantly clear that it does not regard countries east of Germany as part of 'Europe': that title is reserved by Messrs. Wilson and Brown for six States in the west of the continent, plus Britain. But this would not

* Austria came into existence as a State in 1176: Germany in 1871.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

save them from von Thadden's programme: even if they welshed on the State Treaty of 1955 which restored the independence of Austria, they are bound to defend Italy under their Nato and Western European Union obligations of mutual defence (of 1949 and 1955 respectively).

Of course, it was a tactical move for von Thadden not to mention all the German claims in Western Europe. The NDP programme did not speak of Alsace-Lorraine, for example—although all German nationalists for generations have claimed this as a 'German area', annexed by France in the 17th century and again (twice) in the 20th.

However, these details are less important for the moment than the very fact that a legal political party in West Germany has publicly proclaimed its will to make a war of revenge, and has outlined the aims of that war in terms which coincide precisely with those of Hitler in 1939, as established by the Nuremberg Trial of War Criminals after Hitler had been defeated. And, as a special correspondent who attended the congress justifiably remarked (*The Times*, November 13, 1967): 'The NDP is from now on a factor to be reckoned with in the public life of Germany and Europe'.

At this point, of course, one hears the old, old story that the NDP is not a party to be reckoned with seriously. It 'only' has deputies in 6 out of 11 of the State Parliaments of Western Germany; it 'only' has the prospect of winning 10 per cent of the votes for the West German Parliament in 1969 (*The Times* leading article on November 14 pointed out): the average age of its 33,500 members—for long represented as a bunch of old cranks—has 'only' fallen from 50 to 42 between January 1966 and October 1967; nobody in Germany really wants a new war, and if the leading Ministers of West Germany are continually demanding 'nuclear equality', it isn't that they really want to use nuclear weapons. And so forth.

As to the real purposes of the NDP, with the ex-Nazis among its national and regional leaders, Ivor Montagu has given a full and devastating account in his recent book, *Germany's New Nazis* (Panther Books, 5s.). But the essential thing now is that their congress did not take place in a vacuum. It was held in a German State where (i) the big trusts and big banks have reached a higher degree of concentrated strength, in capital and production, than under Hitler, let alone than under the Kaiser of pre-1914 days, (ii) West Germany is producing more materials needed for war than she did in Hitler's day, (iii) she is fully capable of producing nuclear weapons herself if her Government so decides, (iv) her armed forces are the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strongest in Europe (460,000 men in the army), outside the Socialist countries, (v) the machinery of the State, both in the armed forces and on the civil side (Ministers, MPs, judiciary) has large numbers of former active Nazis holding responsible posts, (vi) so-called 'refugee' organisations—voicing just the same territorial claims as von Thadden—bring hundreds of thousands of people to their rallies, and many newspapers selling scores of thousands of copies preach a war of revenge, praise Hitler, rejoice in the achievements of the Nazis, day by day and week by week—thus multiplying the appeal of the NDP a hundredfold, (vii) this goes on in a country where the Communist Party has been banned since 1956 for the 'crime' of demanding a plebiscite on conscription—and where Chancellor Kiesinger (himself a responsible official in Hitler's Foreign Office) announced in October this year that he would press for a change in the electoral law which would prevent any party contesting elections if it favoured recognition of the German Democratic Republic.

In these circumstances, the NDP only plays the part of an 'extremist' or 'irresponsible'—in real terms, unofficial—auxiliary wing of the forces of revenge in Western Germany: big business, militarism, the ideologists of aggression. It is their guerrilla force. It does the propaganda which the 'official' Christian Democrats and Social Democrats in the Coalition Government cannot *at this stage* officially endorse: but they wink at it, they wouldn't dream of repudiating it, because it serves the 'grand design'. Indeed, as another British observer of the West German scene, a million miles removed from Communism, has noted: 'Many CDU leaders are noticeably cautious in their remarks about the National Democrats, and are offering a political home 'for everybody who is Right of the SPD (the Social Democratic Party)' (Norman Crossland in *The Guardian*, December 1, 1967). It is also pertinent, in this connection, that over recent years the NDP has been drawing to itself many supporters of other revenge-seeking groups formed since the war; Ivor Montagu gives a list of more than 90.

The programme adopted at Hanover is therefore not a private fantasy of the NDP: it is the war programme of the new German imperialism, revived with the blessing of the Tory and right-wing Labour leaders after the second world war, just as it was after the defeat of Germany in 1918. And every time the leaders of the West German Government talk about the 'Soviet threat to Europe' and the need for West Germany to possess nuclear arms—as Defence Minister Schroeder did in his party press on December 5 and in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

West German Parliament the next day—that war programme is the reality behind their speeches. The ruling class of the old Germany, now concentrated in the Bonn Republic, always have been past masters in the art of concealing their real aggressive plans, and building up their military and propaganda machine in seemingly disconnected pieces, until the time for dropping the mask has come.

The intended victims should not be fooled. The time to counter the new Nazis' plans is now. It is good news that an all-Party group of MPs have tabled a motion urging the establishment of diplomatic relations with the German Democratic Republic. The frantic efforts of the Bonn rulers to prevent Arab States doing just that is an indication of what a blow it would be to the German imperialists' war plans if Britain took this obvious step to cool their ardour. The other immediate step—one to which the Wilson Government is already morally pledged—is to sign a Treaty of Friendship with the Soviet Union. That too would warn off the West German warmongers for whom the NDP are the outpost. The working-class movement needs to insist on these two acts in simple self-defence, lest 1914 and 1939 come again, in a still more terrible form.

POVERTY '68

Margaret Morris

THE euphoria of the 'never had it so good' era has now given way to a healthier awareness of social realities, including the existence of poverty and deprivation in Britain today. Yet there remain illusions about the limits of poverty and a dangerous tendency to regard the 'poor' as a class apart. This misconception, married with charitable impulses, is being used to sustain the case of those who want to undermine our present social services and reduce the cost under the pretext of introducing 'selectivity'.

Any analysis of poverty is hampered because it is only measurable in its most extreme forms. In the winter of 1963-64 a number of old people died of cold, but there is no record of how many shivered and sneezed their way through the winter because they could not afford heating, nor even of the number who died of other diseases which they might have survived given warmth and comfort. In the same way, although the number of reports of the re-emergence of deficiency diseases, such as rickets, can be counted, it is not possible to measure how many people eat a diet which leaves them outwardly well but

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

short of optimum health and vigour. Living in overcrowded or sub-standard accommodation can be associated with persistent ill-health, particularly bronchial and rheumatic complaints, with mental breakdown or with family breakdown, but there are no exact figures even of extreme cases connected with bad housing.

The best that can be done is to try and estimate the volume of poverty below the exposed tip of the iceberg. Yet this method renders the evidence offered vulnerable to rejection on the grounds that the standard set is too high. Nothing has suffered more in this way than the evidence of the National Food Survey. Each year an attempt to judge the adequacy of the nation's diet is made by comparing information collected on food consumption with the British Medical Association's standard nutritional allowances. Recent reports have flashed danger signals: the proportion of children living in groups of households with an average diet below BMA standards in two or more particulars has increased from 36 per cent in 1960 to 43 per cent in 1964. At the later date no less than 64 per cent of all children lived in groups of households where the average diet was not in all respects adequate. Most of the deficiencies were small but it is still remarkable how little attention has been paid to these surveys. Their warnings have been dismissed with sighs about bad or ignorant housekeeping and the assertion that bad diet has nothing to do with poverty. Yet within these surveys there is a definite correlation between low incomes and inadequate diet.

There is other evidence that health and physique are directly related to social class. (See *Malnutrition in the 1960's*, published by the Office of Health Economics, 162 Regent Street, W.1.) The growth of children varies between poor and better-off districts, and between only-children and those in large families (i.e., where the family resources have to be spread more thinly over the children). At 5½ years the only child from a family in the County of Lancashire is on average 2 inches taller than a child with three or more brothers and sisters living in Salford; while at 14½ years the difference has increased to over 5 inches.

There can be no doubt that the main problem of diet centres round the families with three or more children, but it is not confined to them. Families with only one child had a lower nutrient intake of protein, calcium and Vitamin C in 1964 than in the austerity year of 1950. The prospect for the year ahead is not good. In order to eat adequately families must have sufficient money to spend on food: in 1964 it appeared that an expenditure of no less than 28s. a head, with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more for fast-growing adolescents, was needed to reach BMA standards. Since 1964 food prices have risen and as a result of devaluation are likely to rise by as much as 10 per cent in the next twelve months. Other items of major expenditure have also increased —council rents and heating bills have for many families risen dramatically. Demands on the family purse are thus increasing constantly but wages have been frozen or held down, and the logic of devaluation and the International Monetary Fund loan means that the Government will make every effort to go on holding them down in the year ahead. In such circumstances how many families will manage to attain the BMA standard? An expenditure of 33s.-35s. a head will be necessary; £8 8s. for a family with three children or £6 15s. for a family with one child and one adolescent. Many housewives will feel convinced that they can feed their families adequately on less than this, and by clever management some will do so, but the almost certain result is that the 1968 Food Survey will show an increase in the number of families below standard and that the degree of deficiency in the families now below the line will increase—and it is to be remembered that those families include approximately 64 per cent of all children.

It is the fact that the children figure so prominently in studies of poverty, above all in attempts to assess the adequacy of the food we eat, that gives the problem of poverty its terrible urgency. It is not necessary to be a socialist to believe that society has a duty to protect the health and well-being of its children—Lord Shaftesbury and the factory reformers accepted it in the early 19th century—but any Government calling itself socialist should accept this duty as one of safeguarding children against having to live in poverty, rather than taking special measures to select and help 'poor children'. The specific remedy of free school meals allocated on a means-test basis fails to pass this test and has the additional disadvantage of being inefficient even as a safety net. A recent Government survey showed that only a quarter of the children who qualified for a free dinner because of their father's low income were receiving it, only a half of children in families with a sick or unemployed father and only three-quarters of children from fatherless families. Even if the Government's promise to make this system effective were carried out (which is unlikely) it would only scratch at the surface of the need. Instead of recognising this, the Government is actually planning to increase the charge of school meals from 5s. to 7s. 6d. a week from next April. To do so in the light of the Food Survey would be negligent and irresponsible.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would mean sacrificing our children's diet for a petty economy to please the foreign bankers. It may be that the BMA standard leaves some margin, but have the Government a right to gamble on that?

Withdrawing the increase in the cost of school meals is the cheapest of all measures that the Government could take to prevent a deepening of child poverty as a result of devaluation. In order positively to reduce the dangers it would be necessary to make all meals free as envisaged in the 1944 Education Act. The climate of opinion has swung away from the demand for free school meals, and yet of all the measures for safeguarding children against the effects of poverty free school meals would be the most efficient as the money spent is directly channelled to the child. The present subsidy costs the Government £82 million a year (about the cost of one Polaris) and to abolish the charge completely would increase the bill to about £200 million. No doubt those parents who felt that free meals were beneath their dignity could be allowed to contribute to this sum voluntarily!

School meals by themselves aren't the solution even to child poverty. The problem must be tackled by an assault on a broad front including a £15 minimum wage, better pensions and really meaningful family allowances, together with measures for tackling housing, and slum schools and hospitals in deprived areas. But unless the increases in meal prices are withdrawn before next April, the prospect that the Government will tackle poverty at all is black.

(*Margaret Morris will be completing this important survey of 'Poverty '68' in our February issue, when she will be dealing with family allowances and low incomes.*)

ENGELS AND PIKE ON THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Jurgen Kucvynski

(Translation of an Article by Jurgen Kuczynski in the *Jahrbuch für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* (Economic History Annual), Part I of 1967: 'On the documentation of the condition of the workers at the end of the Industrial Revolution in England':
E. Royston Pike, *Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution in*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain, London, 1966, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 368 pp., 52s. 6d., and
Friedrich Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, Leipzig 1845, 358 pp.)

ONE hundred years elapsed between the work of Pike and that of Engels (the title whereof in the American and English translation is more accurately given as 'The Condition of the working class in England *in 1844*'). Today it is extremely interesting to draw a comparison between the documentation of the two works.

In doing so, we must of course bear in mind that Engels is investigating only the position at the time of his then stay (in England, Trans.), i.e., in the main, is using only documentation going back into the 1830s, whereas Pike seeks to cover the whole industrial revolution in relation to the condition of those who took part in the revolution (human documents)—and one must as a Marxist offer the criticism that he obviously regarded the employers as scarcely human, for his introductory documentation on them is extremely scanty, and I cannot for example see why he gives a section of 21 pages with 20 documents on sexual relations among workers, and not a single document on the sex life of the capitalists.

In the whole work, Pike gives 6 citations on the capitalists and 243 on the condition of the workers.

Only 25 of the 243 come from before 1830, and only 22 from after 1845; thus, at least 47 citations could not come into the picture for Engels' 'Condition of the workers'. (It is regrettable that Pike gives so few quotations from before 1830.)

There remain 196 citations (by Pike) for the period on the sources from which Engels draws; 13 of these come from works which Engels does not cite. Thus, 121 years later, about 85 per cent of all citations come from works which Engels uses with attribution of source.

Which works does Engels not cite?

One quite clear sin of omission, more than made good by Marx later, is his obvious ignorance of William Cobbett's *Political Register*, from which he could have drawn a mass of useful citations. Pike gives two citations from the *Political Register* for the years here in question.

Fielden is mentioned by name only once by Engels, whilst Pike gives 3 citations. Marx quotes him extensively in *Kapital*.

Leonard Horner's Factory Reports are of course mentioned by Engels—but not the really interesting one of 1839, which Pike gives.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An extremely interesting work by John Brown, *A memoir of Robert Blincoe*, etc. (*sic*) (Manchester, 1832), escaped Engels's notice, although he of course quotes extensively from the 2nd Report, *Employment of Children in Manufactories*, in which there is a statement by Blincoe. I should add at once that Brown's work has also escaped the notice of many other students, including myself.

There is a citation by Pike from a speech by Lord Londonderry, which Engels had no reason to mention.

On the other hand, it is regrettable that Engels missed W. Cooke Taylor, an extremely interesting reporter, who remarkably enough was also unknown to Marx. Pike quotes him four times. The *Hand-Loom Weavers' Report*, P.P. (presumably Parliamentary Papers, Transl.) 1840, is not mentioned by Engels, but Pike cites it seven times.

It is possible that Engels did not know *Chambers' Miscellany of useful and entertaining tracts*, Vol. 3, No. 26, Edinburgh 1844; certainly he did not quote from it, whilst Pike did. It is also understandable that Engels does not tell us of the Rules for the management of Liverpool's corporation baths.

The *Mining Commissioner's Report*, P.P. 1844, may have appeared too late for Engels to read it thoroughly. Pike cites it four times.

It is to be noticed that Engels does not use the *Report on the state of Public Health in Birmingham*, P.P. 1843, Vol. XIV, from which Pike quotes; but Engels had plenty of other sources on that topic.

Pike gives three citations from the *Report of the select committee on Public Walks*, P.P. 1833, which Engels did not study, perhaps on account of its curious title.

There remain two extracts from statements by two doctors, which Engels cites from other works than Pike uses.

Thus, in the vast volume of literature of the period, Pike finds only seven works which we have to regret that Engels does not bring to our attention—and not one of these would have altered in the least the picture that Engels gives us. On the other hand, Engels brings us much more literature than Pike quotes—but as a comparison this would not be fair to Pike, for his book consists only of quotations, and in such a book the choice can and must be much more limited than in a simple statement of sources or a citation of a few figures or sentences, as in Engels' work.

To understand Engels' whole achievement, one must set out a whole string of considerations more or less of the following kind:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many people today take up the reading of the *Condition of the Working Class in England* with the thought that this is one of the books of the two masters of research into the condition of the working class and of the laws which determine it. Such an approach is basically wrong, if one wants to judge Engels' achievement; one should say, on the contrary: this is the book of a very young beginner —Engels was 23 years old when he began work on the book—who until then had never worked thoroughly on research into the condition of the workers, having merely occasionally written a few newspaper articles on the subject.

Further; one dates the beginning of his serious study of the condition of the working class in England at December 1842, but this was linked up with the study of political economy, the basic works on which were then pretty well unknown to him. Incidentally, he writes articles on political subjects and collects the first results of his politico-economic studies in his brilliant article: 'Sketches for a critique of the national economy'.

And alongside all this he was busy completing his commercial education in Ermen and Engels' spinning-mill.

In August 1844, twenty months after his arrival, Engels left England, and sent the manuscript to the publishers on March 15, 1845.

And then, 122 years later, we his descendants publish a comparative qualitative analysis of the sources he used, and conclude that he used practically every source that the most up-to-date research employs.

What a wonderful example of work and research technique for our scientists!

It is clear that, if we make a comparison of the sources used by Engels and Pike, the latter's book (in spite of many printing errors) must have a correspondingly good quality.

Translated by D. N. PRITT.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

A History of Economic Thought, William J. Barker. Pelican, 266 pp., 5s.
Education in the Modern World, John Vaizey. Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 254 pp., 12s. 6d.
A Grammar of Politics, Harold J. Laski. Allen & Unwin, 672 pp., 25s.
Parliament and Foreign Affairs, Peter G. Richards, Allen & Unwin, 190 pp., 35s.
The Origin of Life, J. D. Bernal. Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 344 pp., 55s.
The Industrial Society, Raymond Aron. Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 182 pp., 36s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

Introduction to Neo-Colonialism

Jack Woddis

Lawrence & Wishart, 134 pp., 7s. 6d.

'COLONIALISM IS DEAD'—or is it? This theme is brilliantly handled by Jack Woddis in his new book, in which, after analysing the old colonialism of direct political rule for the exploitation of subject people, he exposes the new technique today, and the wide variety of methods, economic, political, military and cultural, by which the imperialists seek to maintain their hold and exploitation, even after they have been forced to concede political independence. This is the technique currently described as 'neo-colonialism'.

'Neo-colonialism' is a relatively modern term. When I had occasion to review Brian Crozier's very inferior book 'Neo-Colonialism' in the January, 1965, issue of this journal, in which the author referred to 'the unknown backroom genius in the Kremlin who coined the term', I tried to search for its earliest use, and could find no earlier clue than in the 1957 edition of my 'Crisis of Britain and the British Empire', written in 1956, in which I suggested that a new term would be necessary to describe these new tactics of imperialism, and offered in quotation marks the term 'New Colonialism'—which became shortened to Neo-Colonialism. Further research, it is to be hoped, will find earlier examples; but this citation shows that as recently as 1956 it was still felt necessary to suggest very diffidently the necessity of coinage of a new term. Yet by 1961 the Third All-African Peoples' Conference was devoting a main resolution to 'Neo-Colonialism'.

Woddis wisely does not spend time on etymology, but concentrates on the reality. His authoritative knowledge in the colonial field has already been demonstrated in his three books on Africa, and is here carried forward to a still wider canvas. There is no doubt that this book provides in a short space and easily read form the most comprehensive and up-to-date factual survey of all the many features and varied practices of neo-colonialism in the present era. As such it is an indispensable guide for the understanding of the problems of modern world politics and the policies of the Western Powers. Its scope ranges over Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and Latin America, and exposes with abundant evidence the neo-colonialist records, not only of Britain, the United States and France, the old colonial powers, but significantly of West Germany.

There is no absolute wall of division between the old and the new colonialism. The two exist together, and it would be a mistake to set up a time schedule as of two epochs. Woddis correctly shows that many of the methods of the new colonialism were already familiar in the old. Lenin long ago exposed the method of maintaining imperialist exploitation and domination behind the forms of politically independent states. Plunder through the terms of trade has a long record behind it. But in the conditions of the advance of national liberation breaking the chains of the old colonial systems of rule the technique of imperialism to seek to circumvent this situation and maintain its exploitation and domination by corresponding special methods does take on the character of a new technique. Woddis exposes the common vulgarisation of the meaning of neo-colonialism, that it only refers to the continuance of economic ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ploitation after political independence has been won, and shows the many forms which this technique takes, political, military and cultural. It may be that in the present latest period more space will have to be accorded than he gives it to the final crude method of the direct military coup when other methods have failed to bring an independent-minded government to subservience.

'Neo-Colonialism', Woddis says in his conclusion, 'will be but a temporary phase . . . The peoples are on the march; and their growing insistence that colonialism in all its forms be ended will prevail'. Indeed, the present crisis of sterling is already the writing on the wall that all the attempts during the past two decades to build up the total of overseas investments and tribute income to hitherto unparalleled heights rest on a shaky foundation. When sterling trembles, eventually the dollar also may follow, when the tiny heroic people of Vietnam are able to make such a gash in the United States balance of payments. We used to speak of the crisis of colonialism. The time has come to speak of the crisis of neo-colonialism.

R.P.D.

The Life of Eleanor Marx, 1855-1895: a Socialist Tragedy

Chushichi Tsuzuki

Clarendon Press, Oxford, 354 pp., 45s.

FOR OVER 30 years, to my certain knowledge, Marxists have been talking of the need for a full-scale biography of Eleanor, politically and personally the most outstanding of Marx's offspring. It is remarkable, to say the least, that the first substantial work in the field should now come from a Japanese scholar, a talented protégé of that well-known orthodox Oxbridge Labour historian Henry Pelling.

So far the only Marxist study of Eleanor, and that a sketch of under 60 pages, has been the section devoted to her in the Soviet work *Docheri Marksa* (Marx's Daughters) by Olga Vorobyova and Irma Sinelnikova, of which a fourth, revised and enlarged edition, appeared in Moscow earlier this year. The importance of the Vorobyova-Sinelnikov study lies in the use it makes of Eleanor's original letters, from the Moscow archives (at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism). I doubt whether Dr. Tsuzuki is aware of this, since the only passing reference he makes is to the German translation, from an earlier Russian edition, which appeared some time ago; this translation unfortunately omits the reference notes which show the extent to which the authors used the MS material at the Institute.

This, however, by the way. Dr. Tsuzuki has drawn on the mass of MS material available other than in Moscow—the great Botticelli collection in Paris, the collections at Amsterdam, Berlin and the British Museum and certain privately-held papers in this country not previously open to researchers. From a most complex jigsaw of original material he has assembled a documentation of exemplary scholarship, a rich quarry for future students; and his English is lucid and agreeable throughout, much more than that of a good many native English writers I can think of.

The central trouble is that for want of a Marxist approach the highly personal, often intimate, character of the correspondence results in a picture where personalities more and more overshadow politics; or, to put it another way, it becomes impossible to see clearly the political wood for the personal trees. Thus we get many pages giving the most lively and excoriating documentation of the undoubted bad character of Dr. Edward

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Aveling, Eleanor's common-law husband, including his involvement and quarrels with the celebrated Secularists Mrs. Annie Besant and Charles Bradlaugh, but only a couple of pages on such a key political event as the 'Bloody Sunday' affair of 1887 in Trafalgar Square and its aftermath. In the chapter dealing with the 'New Unionism' the great Dock Strike of 1889 receives a bare page and a half, while as much space is given to a violent personal attack by H. M. Hyndman on Aveling and its pursuit by an obscure German intriguer named Gilles (who later went mad).

It is ironic, I think, yet nevertheless not without significance, that many of Dr. Tsuzuki's chapter headings have such a journalistic flavour; for example 'Love and Politics', 'Love and Drama', 'Socialism and Free Love', 'Wooing the Dramatic Muse'. Disproportionate space is accordingly given to the theatrical activities and aspirations of Eleanor and Aveling. Similarly an entire chapter, 'The Marxian Legacy', is devoted to the unpleasant story of the intrigues at the end of Engel's life over the disposition of Marx's papers; the significance of this episode is minimal and, whether Dr. Tsuzuki intended it or not, the effect of the intimate unpublished letters he exhumes is disagreeably denigratory of Engels. Historically it is all quite irrelevant; though it is a predictable by-product of a non-Marxist, academic approach to the history of Marxism.

English-born and rooted from the start in the life and politics of this country, Eleanor Marx played a unique part in carrying forward and applying the principles of her immortal father to the nascent modern Labour movement here. To document and illuminate that part, to show how the true Marxist path adumbrated by Eleanor was the one path that could lead the movement forward to final victory, is the task of the Marxist historian. Woven into that central exposition, of course, comes Eleanor's rich, and in the end grimly tragic, personal story. But to conclude, as Dr. Tsuzuki concludes, that the 'common interest of Eleanor and her evil genius Aveling was in the stage as much as in Socialism', or to put her 'Marxism' in quotation marks, is just not on. It may well be gratifying to Mr. Pelling and his right-wing academics; but it is not history.

ALLEN HUTT.

The Reds and the Blacks

William Attwood

Hutchinson, 341 pp., 42s.

AS A REWARD for services rendered as a speech writer in the Kennedy Presidential campaign, a journalist called William Attwood was given the post of US Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea. After working there for two years he moved on to Kenya. The crudeness of the title meaning the Communists and the Africans should prepare the reader for a generally coarse tone. Attwood doesn't go along with the old European stuff of beads for the natives, but he hands out a stack of ball-point pens.

He aims, in the book, to sell the effort to muscle in on Africa, to a somewhat wary American public, which is not all that sure that 'aid' is really paying off. To whip up enthusiasm he sets out to illustrate how with a fistful of dollars and the right line of patter, the Attwoods of this world can save Africa from the 'Reds', and even, from some of the 'Blacks', too.

Inevitably, he exaggerates his own successes, the gullibility of the African, and the ease with which they are to be won for great Western way of life.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He doesn't appear to have an ear for irony; Africans often lard their courtesies generously with this ingredient.

Between telling us how he wooed Sekou Touré away from the 'Soviet bloc', as he chooses to term the Socialist states, and how he got rid of Oginga Odinga from the Government and ruling party of Kenya, he takes us on a quick trip through 21 out of the 38 countries of the continent. Incidentally, next time he visits Timbuctoo, if he doesn't care to stay at the Labanese hotel, the state-owned Rest House will probably be able to accommodate him comfortably.

Crude as the book is, Attwood reveals quite a wide range of neo-colonialist resources and techniques. He gives jolly beach parties, slaps Africans chummily around the shoulders, sends his wife to do a few hours in the local clinic. The Peace Corps and the American teachers were carefully guided (though not all appreciated that), aid was doled out, businessmen encouraged to invest, whistle stop tours organised for visiting senators and a few spies deployed.

'In Africa it always pays to have a good man around the airports; that's where you really find out what's going on . . . or what's about to happen' (p. 204).

'The Government appreciated the leads we were able to furnish them on certain strangers in town' (p. 250).

'The truth is that the Kenyan police asked us to verify their suspicions that certain people were not what they pretended to be, and we had obligingly checked their names against our files' (p. 268).

'But an ambassador who treats his CIA chief as an integral member of his Country Team will generally find him a useful and co-operative associate; I know I did' (p. 180).

In his recent autobiography, *Not Yet Uhuru*, Mr. Odinga, explaining his exclusion from the Government and ruling party of Kenya, says:

'The second thing that disturbed me was that I seemed repeatedly to be the victim of manipulation from forces within our country whose tactics, if not planned in conjunction with external neo-colonialist forces, nevertheless managed with astonishing accuracy, to coincide in intention and effect.'

Attwood was one of those forces, he was only one of a number, but he has spilled some of the beans. His Kenya friends are furious with him. Kenyatta appears as a simple old man, a pliant tool in Attwood's hands. If men like Odinga can be removed in this way, whose turn is it next? The book is banned in Kenya, though as Mr. Oneko, one of Attwood's targets, says, it ought to be widely available so that Kenyans can learn who 'virtually ruled the country'.

The book is a record of one tiny aspect of the Cold War and an expression of the virulence with which it is waged by the most powerful imperialist country. Attwood claims only to be fighting Communism, but perhaps there is more to it than that and Odinga's is the best final comment.

'I am not a Communist but I have been a constant target of anti-Communist forces for all the years of my political history. I am incensed at all these declarations of "fighting Communism", when the target is really African liberation, African independence, and the right of Africans to make policies for their own countries.'

JOAN BELLAMY.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Wobblies: The Industrial Workers of the World

Patrick Renshaw

Eyre and Spottiswoode, 312 *pp.*, 45*s.*

DURING THE PAST few years there has been a revival of interest, chiefly in America, in the Industrial Workers of the World, that body which in its short life contributed a stirring and significant chapter to the history of the labour movement in the United States. Books by Harvey O'Connor and Dr. Philip Foner, and the huge anthology of Wobbly prose and verse, *Rebel Voices*, from the University of Michigan, have all served to kindle new interest and discussion.

Now comes a painstaking and informative attempt at a history of the IWW, within the restrictive limits of some 300 pages, by Patrick Renshaw, an English writer. A difficult job indeed because the IWW arose and functioned at a period in the evolution of American capitalism which in some features has changed. And, as a former organiser, propagandist and writer of the IWW, I could finically pick on this or that minor point which memory of those searing years attests, but that would be unfair.

In one connection, though, I would differ. Referring to the attitude of the IWW towards the capitalist state, the writer uses the term 'political' or 'antipolitical' when I would have used 'electoral' or 'non-parliamentary' perhaps. The IWW did not waste much time on this, but the reformist attitude of the Socialist Party of America, and also the fact that thousands of its members, immigrant to migratory, had no votes anyway, made it borrow from European anarcho-syndicalism the anti-parliamentary attitude; although the IWW was basically Marxist in its approach to economics, history and the general struggle.

What the IWW contributed was to organise those sections of the working-class which the American Federation of Labor craft unions ignored: the foreign immigrants in the East and the migratory workers—lumberjacks, construction 'stiffs', seasonal agricultural workers and others—of the West. These were the social pariahs, neglected, persecuted, exploited, cheated, to whom the IWW gave self-respect and the courage and resolution which arises from solidarity. They sang their songs of conflict, inspired by their own worker-poet Joe Hill, they endured police brutality, prison, during the great free-speech fights; and the attacks by deputy sheriffs or 'vigilantes' during their organisation of the lumber camps and wheat fields.

After its brief life of conflict, struggle, heroism and pioneering achievement, the IWW, as an active force, died, victim of its internal contradictions. One was the effort to combine in one body the rival functions of a society whose members agree on the propaganda and aims of revolutionary socialism, and of an industrial union whose members on the job must be enrolled irrespective of their political, ideological beliefs, if any. Another weakness was the organisation's ambiguous conception of and relation to the capitalist state.

Then came November 7, 1917. And later the publication in the United States of Lenin's *State and Revolution*. And to many of us the queries, so often wearisomely discussed, were answered. The necessity of a militant workers' political party, active on *all* planes, became apparent. Many members of the IWW, and particularly of its leadership, joined the newly formed Communist Party of the United States.

Renshaw's book helps to sustain the knowledge and memory of those dramatic years.

CHARLES ASHLEIGH.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEAGUE TABLE OF STRIKES

(The following table is compiled from International Labour Office figures, as published in the *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, November, 1967. It gives the lie to the frequently-heard charge that Britain is more 'strike-ridden' than other countries. These figures of days lost through strikes show Britain to be tenth in the league of leading industrial countries.—Ed., LM.)

Country	Days lost per 1,000 persons employed during 1965	1966	Position in League
Italy	540	1,700	1
Canada	790	1,550	2
Ireland	1,780	1,460	3
United States ..	860	890	4
India	470	720	5
Australia	390	350	6
Belgium	40	310	7
France	100	240	8
New Zealand ..	50	230	9
United Kingdom ..	220	180	10
Japan	360	170	11
Finland	20	150	12
Sweden	Nil	110	13
Denmark	420	30	14
Netherlands ..	30	10	15
West Germany ..	Nil	Nil	16
Norway	Nil	Nil	
Switzerland	Nil	Nil	

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVALUATION

ALTHOUGH we can safely assume that this wasn't the Government's intention when they devalued, one result of their action has been the immediate rallying to our Fund by many anxious readers, who understand what this economic blast can mean for journals like ours. Letters expressing these fears came with donations —many sent just now at considerable personal sacrifice.

Two young Welsh Fund 'regulars' sending their usual donation, tell us—'Although on the dole at present, press freedom comes high on our list of priorities—never fear'. How *can* we, supported by this kind of loyalty?

'Thank you for all the *LMs* in 1967', writes a long-standing reader from Wiltshire, 'but the December issue especially, with Ted Hill reviewing Wal Hannington's book, gave me an upsurge of delight'. Several other readers have expressed their interest in this review, and the way events in the book spring to life.

A generous donation from a Midlands reader comes with a warm letter of appreciation for all that *LM* has done in the past and is achieving now. 'Please, no thanks for this donation—it is conscience money for the wasted years during which I have forsaken my student ideals. My thanks go to *you*, for having fought on during the same years, under the same editor, for these very same ideals—truth, peace and social justice'.

The Cheshire reader who calls his donation 'an investment in socialism and sanity', has the key to the situation—we can't afford to devalue *LM*.

Helen Falber.

£92 0s. 11d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: C.M.T., £5; H.L. (USA), £5; Marie Philbert, 5s; S. Yudkin, £1; A. Allen, £5; Two Tynesiders, 5s; M.R., £5; John and Jenny Pinkerton, 5s; J. Rink, 5s; K. Rintoul (plus anniversary gift), 15s; L'Humanité (plus extra), 10s; 'S. Mill', £1; R.F.B., £3; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; G.I., 2s 6d; A. Corbett, £1; R. Banerji, £4; Len Perkins, 2s 6d; Mrs. E. Sheldon, £1; R. McLeod, £1; R. Paul, 10s; S. Morrissey, 10s; K. Millward and friends, 7s 6d; M. Bell, £1; Southend Branch, 15s; 'Socialist Sailor', £2; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; K. & B.R. (USA), £4 10s 8d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: C. Dukes, £3; T. I. Nicholas, 13s; J. Smith, 1s 6d; E.H., £1; W.H. (Australia), £8; H.S., £5; C. R. & S. M. Grant, 16s; Dr. Higginton, 3s; W. S. Richards, 13s; G. Cunelli, 13s; R.J.F., 13s; Wm. Wallace, £3 13s; F. Rogers, 3s; Mrs. Albert, 13s; Mrs. Hubert, 13s; R. E. Finch, 13s; R. F. Parr, £2; J.H.C. (Canada), £1 16s 4d; W. D. Parker, £2; 'Anon', £10; A. Collindridge, 10s; Val Boulton, 10s; Norman, 4s; G. F. Shafer, 3s; R. Garrett, 3s; J. J. Prewett, £1; A. Hanrahan, £1 15s 5d.

Our thanks to you all,
Co-op No. L99482

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135

Published by The Trinity Trust, distributed by Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd., and printed by London Caledonian Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE General Executive Council and members of The Amalgamated Society of Boilermakers, Shipwrights, Blacksmiths and Structural Workers send fraternal greetings to all who toil. They renew their resolutions to work for the removal of poverty and for the establishment of world peace.—Daniel McGarvey, President.

LABOUR RESEARCH

HOW TO STOP A RUN ON THE £

WHAT FUEL POLICY?

THE WAGE STOP IN PRACTICE

1s. 6d.—or 1s. 9d. by post

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
78 Blackfriars Road, London, S.E.1

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes.

117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey
'Phone CROydon 4328

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(4s. a line, minimum 12s. Cash with order to: 'Class. Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: 01-876 7254. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume for 1967

A history of the year's events !

A permanent record

A 'must' for every labour movement Library

ORDERS BEING TAKEN NOW!

Through your usual newsagent, price £1 10s 0d, or send 10s 6d plus 2s packing and postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd.
134b Ballards Lane, London, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Society of Graphical and Allied Trades

13/16 Borough Road
London, S.E.1

The Executive Council of
The Society of Graphical and Allied
Trades extends to all members and
friends of SOGAT their sincere wishes
and good luck for a

Happy and a successful
NEW YEAR

Joint General Secretaries
R. W. Briginshaw T. J. Smith

The African Communist

Quarterly Journal of the South African Communist Party

★

A well-informed and analytical survey of the unfolding African Revolution in the light of scientific socialism.

★

Single copy: 2s. 6d.

Annual Subscription: 10s. (U.K. and Europe); 4s. (Africa); $1.50 (America); Airmail £3.

25 per cent reduction to students on surface mail subscriptions.

★

London Distributor:

ELLIS BOWLES
52 PALMERSTON ROAD
LONDON, S.W.14

There's a little slice of America that's not all green . . .

You can take a look at this other America through the pages of the progressive newsweekly

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

- *a dead-end foreign policy*
- *the crisis in jobs, housing, schools*
- *frustrations in the fight for Negro rights*
- *who's for progress, and how*

Subscribe to

NATIONAL GUARDIAN
today

through the London Bureau, 67 Covington Way, London, SW16

1 year sub. - - 60s.
1 year student sub. - - 36s.
13 week introductory sub. 10s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED